

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Upon entry of this amendment, which amends claims 1, 5, and 9, and cancels claims 11-13, and adds new claims 14-22 claims 1-10 and 14-22 will be pending. In the office action, claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mo et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,652,588, hereinafter “Mo”); claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Adolph et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,323, hereinafter “Adolph”); claims 5-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mo in view of Daum et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,876, hereinafter “Daum”); and claims 5-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Adolph in view of Daum. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments above and remarks below.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mo. Applicants submit that Mo does not disclose or suggest wherein the plurality of file system processes are paused at a point during execution according to the status information to wait for input from another process if input is needed to allow processing of isochronous files and asynchronous files.

Mo discloses a method for storing and retrieving telemetry. Mo does not disclose or suggest a selective pausing of a file system process during execution according to status information to wait for input from another process if input is needed. Also, Mo does not disclose or suggest that this allows processing of isochronous files and asynchronous files. Isochronous files may be time dependent files which may be large. When a file system process is being executed, the time to retrieve the isochronous file may be long and thus execution of the file system process during the retrieval may cause glitches or data corruption while waiting to retrieve the file. However, asynchronous files may be non-time dependent files and may be relatively small. Thus, the file system process may or may not need to be paused to wait for the retrieval of a small asynchronous file. By determining status information on when to pause a file

system process, particular embodiments allow the processing of isochronous files and asynchronous files. Applicants submit that Mo does not disclose or suggest pausing the file system process during execution according to status information. Further, Mo does not disclose or suggest that this allows processing of isochronous files and asynchronous files.

Also, when the file system process is paused, a plurality of variables may be stored in a dedicated location for the process. Thus, when multiple processes are being executed in parallel, it is ensured that variables for the paused process are not corrupted by another process. As recited in claim 1, when execution of a file system process is re-started from being paused, variables are retrieved from a dedicated location. Applicants submit that Mo does not disclose or suggest retrieving variables from a dedicated location for a file system process that is re-started from being paused.

Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Adolph. Adolph does not disclose or suggest a plurality of file system processes that are paused at a point during execution according to the status information to wait for input from another process if input is needed to allow processing of isochronous files and asynchronous files. Adolph is directed towards an audio and video decoder where commands may be stored for decoding of information. Applicants submit that Adolph does not disclose or suggest pausing file system processes. Rather, status is updated for the command in the command buffer but Adolph does not disclose or suggest pausing of processes. Also, Adolph does not disclose or suggest that the pausing allows processing of isochronous files and asynchronous files. Adolph discloses decoding of data, which does not disclose or suggest selective pausing of file system processes for processing isochronous files and asynchronous files.

Also, Adolph does not disclose or suggest that a plurality of variables may be stored in a dedicated location for the process when the file system process is paused. Adolph may disclose a memory for storing commands and parameters. *See Adolph*, col. 3, lines 60-67. But,

nowhere is it disclosed or suggested that the memory location is a dedicated location for the memory process or that the variables are retrieved from the dedicated location for the file system process that is re-started from being paused.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim

1. Claims 2-4 and 14-17 depend from claim 1 and thus derive patentability at least therefrom.

Applicants submit that claims 5-10 and 17-22 should be allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed with respect to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly sought. The undersigned may be contacted at the telephone number below at the Examiner's convenience if it would help in the prosecution of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

TRELLIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
LAW GROUP, PC

By \_\_\_\_\_/Brian N. Young/\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian N. Young  
Reg. No. 48,602  
Tel.: 650-842-0300